

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this Amendment, claims 1-18 were pending with claims 1, 8, 13, 14, and 15 being independent. By this Amendment, new claim 19 has been added.

Responding to the Examiner's arguments on claim 1 stated in the Advisory Action, as noted in the August 8, 2011 Response, Ross, whose teletext is TV-mode mode data, is unrelated to communication mode associated data, and thus does not cure Jang's deficiency in connection with "wherein, if the communication mode occurs when the television mode is selected, said video processing means ...block-copies *the communication mode associated data* and displays the block-copied *communication mode associated data* on the displayed television signal when the television video signal is scaled up and displayed in the first and second display areas" (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Ross and Jang cannot be combined to arrive at the above-quoted claimed subject matter.

Additionally, the Examiner is clearly incorrect in alleging that the cited col. 2, lines 10-31 of Ross discloses "block-copying" of any kind of data. First, the cited col. 2, lines 10-31 and Figs. 1 and 2 of Ross disclose creating the reduced contrast by causing a predetermined pattern of pixels of a received picture within a predetermined area to be switched to a constant background color, disclosures which are unrelated to block-copying. Second, "block-copy" is a term well known in the art, and thus does not need any express definition to apprise those skilled in the art of its meaning. On the other hand, the Examiner has yet established a prima facie case as to why the term is not readily understood by those skilled in the art in view of the specification. As such, the Examiner's allegation that the cited col. 2, lines 10-31 and Figs. 1 and 2 of Ross disclose "block-copying" of any kind of data is clearly incorrect. Therefore, Ross also does not cure acknowledged Jang's deficiencies in connection with "block-copying". Consequently, also for this reason, Ross and Jang cannot be combined to arrive at the above-quoted claimed subject matter.

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons as well as Applicants' other reasons stated in the August 8, 2011 Response, the Examiner's rejections should be withdrawn.

Amendment filed on September 8, 2011 concurrently with RCE
Further responding to final office action mailed June 8, 2011 and responding to advisory action of
August 30, 2011
App. Ser. No. 10/658,545

In view of the above, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below. Should any/additional fees be required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 18-2220.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jundong Ma/
Jundong Ma
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 61,789

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: September 8, 2011